

## REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,367,246 (Hirota) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,568,179 (Deeba). For at least the reasons provided below, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection.

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicted that he did not consider Applicants' previously submitted argument regarding the minimization of coking due to the presence of the platinum, because the feature was not explicitly recited in the claims. Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite that the platinum minimizes coking of the hydrocarbon adsorber. Support for this feature may be found in paragraph [0024] of U.S. 2007-0119152.

Nothing in either reference suggests that the low level Pt content in Applicants' claimed adsorber would render the system functional. Applicants' reemphasize that by specifying this low level of Pt, their adsorber will work only as a decoking catalyst, and there is a minimization of coking of the adsorber. This is not taught by the prior art. Therefore, until Applicants' invention, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to use Applicants' claimed amount of Pt, and claim 1 and the claims that depend on it are patentable over the prior art.

Moreover, even if the Examiner maintains the rejection of claim 1, Applicants nonetheless assert that claim 10 is still patentable, which Applicants have added and which makes explicit that there is an absence of compounds that would prevent the hydrocarbon adsorber from continuously burning hydrocarbons stored therein. Support of this feature may be found in paragraph [0024] of U.S. 2007-0119152. Hirota teaches away from this feature because he urgently needs a sufficiently active species on his HC adsorber. See col. 6, lines 7 *et seq.* of Hirota.

Applicants also note that the pending rejection is based on a combination of references that Examiner previously combined in an Office Action dated February 18, 2010. That rejection was overcome by the inclusion of a feature directed to the inclusion of a first oxidation catalyst that is not part of an underflow area of a motor vehicle. See Interview Summary dated April 29, 2010. At this time, it appears that the Examiner is reversing his position, and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner explain this reversal of position.

Applicants: Gieshoff, *et al.*  
Appl. Ser. No.: 10/556,643  
Filing Date: December 11, 2006  
Response to Non-Final Office Action  
Page 5 of 5

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Applicants submit that no fee is due. If any fees are deemed due, please charge Deposit Account No. 11-0171 for such sum. Additionally, if the Examiner has any questions regarding the present application, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicants' attorney at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Locke/  
Scott D. Locke, Esq.  
Registration No.: 44,877  
Attorney for Applicants

Kalow & Springut LLP  
Telephone No.: (212) 813-1600